



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/866,857	05/30/1997	DAVID CORBOY	06651/008001	1383
26171	7590	11/02/2005		
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			EXAMINER HUYNH, CONG LAC T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/866,857

Applicant(s)

CORBOY, DAVID

Examiner

Cong-Lac Huynh

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 122-178 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 174-187 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 122-136 and 140-173 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 137-139 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communication: election filed 8/18/05 to the application filed on 05/30/97.
2. Applicant elected Group I (claims 122-173) without traverse.
3. Claims 122-178 are pending in the case. Claims 122, 157, 166 are independent claims.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 122 is objected to as including a typographical error: the word "object" should be in plural within "before all data slices of *the first and second* multimedia object"(line 13).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claims 166-173 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 166-173 are directed to a computer implemented multimedia document, which is merely a non-functional descriptive material since they do not recite at least one functional element. See MPEP 2106.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2178

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. Claims 124 and 130 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Regarding claim 124, which is *dependent on claim 122*, it is impossible that all of the data slices of the third multimedia object are progressively rendered before any of the data slices of the *first and second multimedia objects are progressively rendered*.

As recited in claim 122, the *data slices of the first and second multimedia objects are progressively rendered before* all data slices of the first and second multimedia objects are received, and the data slices of the *third multimedia object are progressively rendered only after* a sufficient amount of the data slices of *the third multimedia object are received* to enable rendering the third object.

Thus, based on claim 122, it appears that the third multimedia object can not be rendered before the rendering of the first and second multimedia object.

Regarding claim 130, which is dependent on claim 122, it is impossible that rendering of the first, second, and third files is delayed until all of the objects of the third file are received by the recipient.

Art Unit: 2178

As recited in claim 122, the *data slices of the first and second multimedia objects are progressively rendered before all data slices of the first and second multimedia objects are received*, and the data slices of the *third multimedia object are progressively rendered only after a sufficient amount of the data slices of the third multimedia object are received* to enable rendering the third object.

Thus, based on claim 122, it appears that the first and the second multimedia objects are rendered before the rendering of the third multimedia object, and thus such delay does not happen.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 122-123, 125-129, 132, 134-136, 140, 143-146, 153-173 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Near et al. (US Pat No. 5,995,091, 11/30/99, filed 5/10/96).

Regarding independent claim 122, Near discloses:

- receiving author specification of multimedia content and choreography information that indicates a temporal order for rendering the multimedia content, the multimedia content being defined by at least first, second, and third multimedia objects (**figure 2, col 3, line 28 to col 4, line 15, col 9, lines 51-67:**

the arrangement of the interleaved playback includes media portions such as video chunk 1, audio chunk 1, video chunk 2, video chunk 3 where each portion has associated timestamp, engine destination, and message shows the choreography information associated with media portion and the temporal order of display among the objects; the authoring tool used by an author for specifying images and sounds for playback at specified times implies the author specification of multimedia content and choreography information for rendering the multimedia content defined by at least first, second, and third multimedia objects)

- interleaving data slides of the first and second multimedia objects with each other and adding the interleaved data slides to a multimedia document (col 9, lines 20-67)
- adding the data slices of the first and second multimedia objects to the multimedia document without interleaving the data slices of the third multimedia object with data slices of other objects in the multimedia document (**col 9, lines 21-67, col 13, lines 1-34**: interleaving multimedia objects and adding these objects to the multimedia document; some *separate* audio and video are combined to reproduce the playback output shows that said separate audio and video are added to the multimedia document playback without interleaving)
- streaming the multimedia document to a recipient for rendering according to the choreography information (**col 3, line 64 to col 4, line 61, col 7, line 37 to col 8, line 20, col 12, line 52 to col 13, line 34**)

Art Unit: 2178

Near does not explicitly disclose said streaming is carried out such that the data slices of the first and second multimedia objects are progressively rendered before all data slices of the first and second multimedia objects are received and the data slices of the third multimedia object are progressively rendered only after a sufficient amount of the data slices of the third multimedia object are received to enable rendering of the third multimedia object.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined the feature of progressively rendering the first and second multimedia objects before all of their data slices are received, and progressively rendering the third multimedia object only after a sufficient amount of its data slices is received for the following reason. The interleaving of multimedia data was known to help speeding up the rendering process. Therefore, the first and second multimedia objects, which are interleaved, are rendered before all of their data are received. The third object, which is not interleaved, is rendered in a normal process, which means it is rendered when receiving all of its data.

Regarding claim 123, which is dependent on claim 122, Near discloses that the data slices of the first, second, and third multimedia objects are rendered progressively together (**col 3, line 28 to col 4, line 15, col 9, lines 51-67: playback the multimedia object shows that data of a plurality of multimedia objects including the first, second, and third objects are progressively rendered**).

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 125, which is dependent on claim 122, Near discloses that all of the data slices of the third multimedia object are progressively rendered after any of the data slices of the first and second multimedia objects are progressively rendered (see claim 122).

Regarding claim 126, which are dependent on claim 122, Near discloses that the data slices of the first and second multimedia objects can be progressively rendered independent of bandwidth without degradation (col 2, lines 61-67: generating a bandwidth-controlled presentation data stream, thereby controlling network load and providing predictable performance on a variety of playback systems implies that the playback performance is not dependent on the bandwidth since the network load while sending media data is controlled via the authoring tool).

Regarding claim 127, which is dependent on claim 122, Near discloses that the data slices of the third multimedia object cannot be progressively rendered independent of bandwidth without degradation (col 13, lines 1-34: since some specified audio and image files are separate from the other multimedia objects, so they are not interleaved with the other multimedia objects, rendering of these objects is performed when all of the data slices of these objects are received, and thus in a slower process).

Regarding claim 128, which is dependent on claim 122, Near discloses that the data slices of the third multimedia object are rendered only after all of the data slices of the

Art Unit: 2178

third multimedia object are received (as in claim 122, rendering of the third object occurs when all data slices of the third object are received).

Regarding claim 129, which is dependent on claim 122, Near discloses that the choreography information comprises an indication of the author's intent that the first, second and third files be rendered substantially together (col 3, line 32 to col 4, line 27).

Regarding claims 132 and 134, which are dependent on claim 122, Near discloses that the first object comprises an image file (figure 2, the optional data in the video chunk can be image file).

Regarding claim 135, which is dependent on claim 122, Near discloses that the third object comprises a sound file (col 3, line 56 to col 4, line 26).

Regarding claim 136, which is dependent on claim 122, Near discloses that the third object comprises a video file (figure 2).

Regarding claim 140, which is dependent on claim 122, Near discloses rendering the multimedia document in a window on a computer display at the recipient (col 13, lines 23-34).

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 143, which is dependent on claim 122, Near discloses that each object has an address indicating a player that plays the object (col 8, lines 1-13; col 4, lines 47-61: identifying images and sounds to be reproduced during the playback implies identifying the address of the media element and the software that plays the media).

Regarding claim 144, which is dependent on claim 122, Near discloses compressing information in each object (col 8, lines 13-29, col 9, lines 20-39; col 4, lines 47-61).

Regarding claim 145, which is dependent on claim 122, Near discloses creating an object in the file (col 9, lines 20-50) and locating player data within an object defining a player that plays the object (col 10, lines 40-67: playback media software used to identify individual portion of the playback data stream and the manager software calls a function for a player element of media data).

Near does not disclose the created object is an unknown object. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Near to include the created object being an unknown object for the following reason. Near defines the multimedia data for the playback data stream where each multimedia element is considered as an object in the data stream (figure 2, col 51-67). Thus no matter the object is known or unknown, the system always locates the player associated with the multimedia element.

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 146, which is dependent on claim 122, Near discloses two or more of the objects have at least one common attribute, including at least one of a command for perception of the objects, an ability to pass and receive message, and an ability to supply and retrieve the data embodied in the objects (col 4, lines 47-61: the fact that each multimedia object is *identified* by the interleaver element implies that the multimedia objects have a command for perception the object, which is a common attribute of the objects) .

Regarding claim 153, which is dependent on claim 122, Near discloses that the temporal order is independent of a recipient input (col 3, line 64 to col 4, line 27, col 7, lines 50-64: the fact that the playback of the images and sound data stream with specified times is generated by an author for a selected bandwidth shows that the temporal order is defined by the author, and thus is maintained independent of a recipient).

Regarding claim 154, which is dependent on claim 122, Near discloses that the temporal order is independent of a recipient hardware configuration (col 3, lines 48-55: since the temporal order is defined by an author, the author controls the playback, and thus independent of the recipient hardware configuration).

Regarding claim 155, which is dependent on claim 122, Near discloses that the temporal order is independent of a recipient software configuration (col 3, lines 48-55:

Art Unit: 2178

since the temporal order is defined by an author, the author controls the playback, and thus independent of the recipient software configuration).

Regarding claim 156, which is dependent on claim 122, Near discloses that the media content is rendered independent of an author-specified bandwidth to be used to send the multimedia document (**col 8, lines 1-28**: no matter the bandwidth selected by the author used to send the multimedia document is sufficient or insufficient, rendering of the multimedia document is still performed via the playback).

Claims 157-164 are for a computer device to perform the method claim 122-128, 137, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 165 is for a computer device to perform the method claim 156, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 166-172 are for the document included in method claim 122-128, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 173 is for the document included in method claim 156, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2178

11. Claims 131 and 133 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Near as applied to claim 122 above, and further in view of Cave et al. (US Pat No. 5,943,046, 8/24/99, filed 7/19/95).

Regarding claims 131 and 133, which are dependent on claim 122, Near discloses a multimedia system for performance playback multimedia data (col 3, lines 28-47). Near does not disclose explicitly that the first and second multimedia objects comprises a text file.

Cave discloses that the multimedia objects include voice, music, pictures and text (col 2, lines 60-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Cave into Near for incorporate text files into the multimedia objects for having different types of objects in the multimedia documents.

12. Claims 141, 147-148 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Near as applied to claim 140 above, and further in view of Shaw et al., *Microsoft Office 6-in-1*, Que Corporation 1994, pages 379-380, 384-389, 396-402, 419-425, 492-496.

Regarding claim 141, which is dependent on claim 140, Near does not disclose:

- creating an exclusionary area within the window

Art Unit: 2178

- locating an object within the exclusionary area, the object being selected from a group of objects including a framed image, a slide show, framed text, sound data, a separator, or a hyperlink

Shaw discloses:

- creating an exclusionary area within the window (page 401, figure 4.4)
- locating an object within the exclusionary area, the object being selected from a group of objects including a framed image, a slide show, framed text, sound data, a separator, or a hyperlink (page 401, figure 4.4: the data in the area within the window can be text and graphics).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Shaw into Near since Shaw teaches the window features for locating objects selected from a group of *specific objects* providing the advantage to include in Near to enhance the use of objects from internet instead of merely video or audio from the media database.

Regarding claims 147 and 148, which are dependent on claims 122 and 147 respectively, Near does not disclose the document forms a code segment that receives image information, and wherein the image information is used to construct an image frame for a framed image that is part of the multimedia document.

Shaw discloses that the document forms a code segment that receives image information, and wherein the image information is used to construct an image frame for a framed image that is part of the multimedia document (pages 400-401).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Shaw into Near since Shaw a code segment to control the receiving of image information as well as the structure of the media stream providing the advantage of utilizing such control to edit the media stream in Near as desired.

13. Claim 142 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Near as applied to claim 122 above, and further in view of Johnson (US Pat No. 5,892,847, 4/6/99, filed 4/22/96).

Regarding claim 142, which are dependent on claim 122, Near does not disclose defining as well as locating the update splash image within the data file.

Johnson discloses:

- splash image data defining a splash image and locating the splash image data within the data file for displaying the splash image on the computer display (col 4, lines 30-50)
- further updating the splash image to be displayed (col 4, lines 30-63)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Johnson into Near since Johnson teaches the process of displaying of a splash image, which is an element of a multimedia document providing the advantage of including a splash image into the image file to enhance the image characteristics in Near.

Art Unit: 2178

14. Claims 149-152 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Near as applied to claim 122 above, and further in view of Caire et al. (US Pat No. 5,663,962, 9/2/97, filed 9/15/95).

Regarding claim 149, which is dependent on claim 122, Near discloses a header, timestamps, and associated data for a data stream (col 5, line 64 to col 6, line 16).

Near does not disclose that the choreography information further comprises an object archive for storing information about one or more objects, the object archive including information about the relationship of the object file with the document, and a multiplex section including data for the objects in the document.

Caire discloses:

- a header (col 1, lines 65 to col 2, lines 1-2, each packet in the overall stream includes a header)
- an object archive for storing information about the plurality of object files, the object archive including information about *the level of each object file with the hierarchy* (col 1, lines 65 to col 2, lines 1-2, each packet of the multimedia stream stores information; col 1, lines 37-52, it is desired for instance to *insert into the complete stream also some subtitles* to be displayed during the presentation....)
- a multiplex section including data for each of the object files of the document (col 1, lines 65 to col 2, lines 1-9, 45-59)
- the object files in the multiplex section are each played by a player as the multiplex object file is received by a receiver (col 1, lines 65 to col 2, lines 1-2)

Art Unit: 2178

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Caire into Near since Caire provides the choreography and the multiplexing features for a multimedia presentation. The combination of Caire into Near would provide more detailed options in the relationship of the objects in a multimedia document to effectively controlling and changing the presentation of the objects.

Regarding claims 150 and 151, which are dependent on claims 149 and 150 respectively, Near does not disclose an object number counter indicating the number of objects, a plurality of object descriptions, each object description describing a corresponding one of the objects, and a choreography group providing information about a first group of objects, a group object counter indicating the number objects in the choreography group, size and type data for each object, header data, data slices of the objects interleaved together, and placing one or more slice size data blocks before one or more of the interleaved data slices, each slice size data block corresponding to a data slice and providing a size of the corresponding data slice.

Caire discloses:

- an object number counter indicating the number of object files (col 2, lines 10-20)
- a plurality of object descriptions, each object description describing a corresponding one of the object files (col 1, lines 65 to col 2, lines 1-2, the header includes information of the type of a packet in the multimedia stream)

- a choreography group providing information about a first group of object files (col 1, lines 65 to col 2, lines 1-2, packets of different types are included in the overall stream as a sequence of intervals wherein the type of a packet is disclosed in the heading are considered as a choreography group providing information about the object files)
- size and type data for each object file (col 1, lines 65 to col 2, lines 1-2, data type of each packet in the multimedia stream)
- header data (col 1, lines 65 to col 2, lines 1-2, each packet includes a header)
- the data slices of the object files interleaved together (col 1, lines 65 to col 2, lines 1-2, the overall stream is structured as a sequence of intervals called packets, each of which contains data of single type, indicated in a header of the packet itself; since data of different types are arranged in the *sequence of intervals called packets*, the packets which are equivalent to the object files, are interleaved together)
- a first player pointer including an address of a player that plays the choreography group (col 2, lines 3-9, for each interval, the multiplexer has to decide from which the input stream it should take the data in order to construct the packets; this implies that the multiplexer has to decide where to point to play the overall stream which is equivalent to the choreography group as mentioned above)
- locating a plurality of slice size data blocks before the interleaved data slices, each slice size data block corresponding to one of the data slices and providing a size of the corresponding data slice (col 4, lines 45-53, the number of data bytes

and the number of header bytes in each packet show the size of each packet which is equivalent to the data block)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Caire into Near since Caire provides the choreography and the multiplexing features for a multimedia presentation. The combination of Caire and Near would provide the relationship of the objects in a multimedia document for effectively controlling and changing the presentation of the objects.

Regarding claim 152, which is dependent on claim 150, Near does not disclose a non-multiplex section following the multiplex section where the non-multiplex section includes one or more separate objects that are not played by a player as the separate object files are received by a receiver.

Caire discloses a plurality of separate object files that are not played by a player as the separate object files are received by a receiver (col 1, lines 37-45, ...*video and audio information have to be separated* again, by an inverse of demultiplexing process, as presentation occurs on different devices...).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Caire into Near since Caire provides the choreography and the multiplexing features for a multimedia presentation. The combination of Caire and Near would provide the relationship of the objects in a multimedia document for effectively controlling and changing the presentation of the objects.

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments filed 5/10/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that Near does not disclose "adding data slices of the third multimedia object to the multimedia object without interleaving the data slices of the third multimedia object with data slices of other objects in the multimedia document"

(Remarks, page 12).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

First of all, it is not clear what Applicants want to argue since the claim recites adding data slices of the third multimedia object to the multimedia document whereas the argument refers to adding data slices of the third multimedia object to the multimedia object.

Near discloses the argued feature. See claim rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

16. Claims 137-139 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

17. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Yager et al. (US Pat No. 5,983,236, 11/9/99, filed 7/28/97, priority 7/20/94).

Fukushima et al. (US Pat No. 5,798,995, 8/25/98, filed 2/14/97).

Tarr et al. (US Pat No. 5,935,004, 8/10/99, filed 8/28/95).

Baumgartner et al. (US Pat No. 5,642,171, 6/24/97, filed 6/8/94).

Harscoet et al. (US Pat No. 5,615,401, 3/25/97).

Yamauchi et al. (US Pat No. 6,088,507, 7/11/00, filed 4/3/97).

Gibbons et al. (US Pat No. 6,100,881, 8/8/00, filed 10/22/97).

Diallo et al. (US Pat No. 5,929,857, 7/27/99, filed 9/10/97).

Ottesen et al. (US Pat No. 5,630,104, 5/13/97, filed 5/18/95).

Art Unit: 2178

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-4125. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-4125.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Cong-Lac Huynh
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2178
10/28/05